

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on May 9, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 10, 22 and 25 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-25 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Support for Claim Amendments

The amendments to Claims 1, 10, 22 and 25 are fully supported in Applicants' specification. See, for example, paragraph 14 of the specification.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 7, 12, 14, 16 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,215,857 to Kasiviswanathan (hereinafter "Kasiv"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because all of the elements in Claims 1, 7, 12, 14, 16 and 25 are not found, either expressly or inherently described, in Kasiv.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "A method for providing a no-ring telephone call service, the method comprising: receiving notification that a telephone call from a calling party device requesting to use the no-ring telephone call service has arrived at a switch, the notification including a called party telephone number; and determining if the called party telephone number corresponds to a voice mail platform telephone number in a region wide messaging database, wherein: when the called party telephone number corresponds to a voice mail platform telephone number, instructions to route the telephone call to the voice mail platform telephone number are communicated to the switch; when the called party telephone number does not correspond to a voice mail platform telephone number, instructions to play a pre-recorded message are communicated to the switch, the pre-recorded message including a direct connect option for completing the telephone call to the called party telephone number including ringing a device at the called party telephone number; and when the calling party device selects the direct connect

option, the no-ring telephone call application sends instructions to the switch to complete the telephone call.” (Emphasis added.)

Kasiv teaches allowing a calling subscriber to directly forward a call to a voice mail system in order to leave a message for the called party without disturbing (ringing) the called party. (Kasiv; Abstract.) Kasiv further teaches that when the voice mail system is not assigned to the called party or is inactive, that a message is played to the calling subscriber stating that the voice mail system is not available. Then, the call is “torn down without being set-up.” (Kasiv; Col. 5, lines 60-67).

Kasiv does not teach “when the called party telephone number does not correspond to a voice mail platform telephone number ...a direct connect option for completing the telephone call to the called party telephone number including ringing a device at the called party telephone number; and when the calling party device selects the direct connect option, the no-ring telephone call application sends instructions to the switch to complete the telephone call” as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Kasiv for at least the reason that Kasiv fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, all of the elements of Claim 1.

Since they contain similar elements, Claims 10 and 25 are patentable over Kasiv for at least the reasons given above for Claim 1. Claim 7 depends from Claim 1, and thus is believed to be allowable at least due to its dependency on Claim 1. Claims 12, 14 and 16 depend from Claim 10, and thus are allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 10.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-5, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-21 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasiv. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Kasiv fails to teach or suggest all of the elements in Claims 2-5, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-21 and 22-24.

As stated above, Kasiv fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 1, from which Claims 2-5 and 8-9 depend. Kasiv fails to teach or suggest at least the elements “when the called party telephone number does not correspond to a voice mail platform telephone number ...a direct

connect option for completing the telephone call to the called party telephone number including ringing a device at the called party telephone number; and when the calling party device selects the direct connect option, the no-ring telephone call application sends instructions to the switch to complete the telephone call”, as recited in Claim 1. In contrast, as stated above, Kasiv teaches that the telephone call is torn down before it is set up when the called party does not have an accessible voice mail system. Accordingly, Kasiv does not teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1. Applicants submit that Claims 2-5 and 7-8 are allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 1. Further, because they contain elements that are similar to Claim 1, Applicants submit that Claims 10 and 22 are patentable for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is patentable. Applicants further submit that Claims 11, 13, 15 and 17-21 are allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 10. Applicants further submit that Claims 23-24 are allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 22.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasiv in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,181,238 to Medamana et al. (hereinafter “Medamana”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Kasiv in view of Medamana fails to teach or suggest all of the elements in Claim 6.

As stated above, Kasiv fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 1, from which Claim 6 depends. In addition, Medamana fails to teach or suggest at least the elements “when the called party telephone number does not correspond to a voice mail platform telephone number ...a direct connect option for completing the telephone call to the called party telephone number including ringing a device at the called party telephone number; and when the calling party device selects the direct connect option, the no-ring telephone call application sends instructions to the switch to complete the telephone call”, as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Medamana does not cure the deficiencies of Kasiv with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, neither Kasiv nor Medamana, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claim 1. Applicants submit that Claim 6 is allowable at least due to its dependency on Claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Anne Davis Barry

Registration No. 47,408

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 36192

Date: September 11, 2006